



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCI United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                      | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR   | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/527,775                           | 03/14/2005  | Adrianus Van Bezooijen | NL 020886           | NL 020886 1786   |  |
| 65913<br>NXP, B.V.                   | 7590 07/03. | /2007                  | EXAMINER            |                  |  |
| NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT |             |                        | CHAN, R             | CHAN, RICHARD    |  |
| M/S41-SJ<br>1109 MCKA                | Y DRIVE .   |                        | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| SAN JOSE, CA 95131                   |             |                        | 2618                |                  |  |
|                                      |             |                        |                     |                  |  |
| 1                                    | ·           |                        | NOTIFICATION DATE   | DELIVERY MODE    |  |
|                                      |             |                        | 07/03/2007          | ELECTRONIC       |  |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)         |  |  |
|-----------------|----------------------|--|--|
| 10/527,775      | VAN BEZOOIJEN ET AL. |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit             |  |  |
| Richard Chan    | 2618                 |  |  |

|  | Richard Chan   | 2618  |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence add                                       | ress                                      |  |  |  |  |
| HE REPLY FILED 11 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.   |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:  | wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff<br>otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c  | idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C            | nce, which<br>FR 41.31; or (3)            |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date   | e of the final rejection.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7   | later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 106.07(f).   | g date of the final reject<br>E FIRST REPLY WAS F       | ion.<br>FILED WITHIN                      |  |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exampler 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | dension and the corresponding amount<br>shortened statutory period for reply orig<br>or than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Off      | riate extension fee ice action; or (2) as |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS  | ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of the                                  | hs of the date of<br>ne appeal. Since     |  |  |  |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  | but prior to the date of filing a brief  | , will <u>not</u> be entered b                          | ecause                                    |  |  |  |  |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beautiful appeal; and/or</li> </ul>  |  | ducing or simplifying                                   | the issues for                            |  |  |  |  |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a   | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  | jected claims.  |   |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1   |  | ompliant Amendment                                      | (PTOL-324).                               |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  | ill be entered and an                                   | explanation of                            |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  | ut before or on the date of filing a N<br>nd sufficient reasons why the affida   | lotice of Appeal will <u>n</u><br>vit or other evidence | ot be entered is necessary and            |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa</li> </ol>   | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appery and was not earlier presented. S   | eal and/or appellant fa<br>See 37 CFR 41.33(d)          | ails to provide a (1).                    |  |  |  |  |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   | on of the status of the claims after e   | entry is below or attac                                 | hed.                                      |  |  |  |  |
| 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered b <u>Please See Continuation Sheet.</u>  | ut does NOT place the application i  | n condition for allowa                                  | nce because:                              |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 13.  | •  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |

Continuation of 11: With respect to applicant's arguments regarding claim 1 and 12, the applicant states that Camp reference fails to correspond to all the claimed limitations, specifically the limitation directed to performing a comparison of the output voltage to produce a control signal and using the control signal to operate the output unit below its saturation level.

However the examiner points the applicant to Fig.1, wherein the power detetor 42 measures the output power of the power amplifier 32 with module 42 labeled "Power Detector". The reading is than translated to digital using ADC 44. The value of the ADC is than converter by conversion module 46, which is than compared and calculated with module 48. This value is than compared with the Magnitude Function module. The result is than modified by correction table 34, which than modifies the amplitude of the system. (Col.3 line 60-67)

With respect to applicant's arguments regarding claim 4 and 15, the applicant states that the Chen reference fails to disclose an adaptation of the matching circuits 32, 33, and 34 wherein the adapting the drive level of the RD power output unit to operate the RF output below its saturation for perserving linearity of the power amplifier..

However the examiner points the applicant to Col.2 line 57-65. The Chen reference discloses wherein the matching circuits input a signal to the power detector, which in turn send detection signals "DS...". The DS signals are the input to the bias control circuit which 50, which control the operation environment for the amplifiers. The examiner than points the applicant to the Chen Passage Col.2 line 41-44) wherein the description of the object of the invention is specified "Thus, the object of the invention is to achieve a linear control by way of detecting the power outputted from the first and second stages."

Richard Chan Art Division 2618 6/20/07

> NAY MAUNG SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER